

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 94 04:30:16 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #247
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 10 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 247

Today's Topics:

 Question about Radar Jamming
 Usefulness of the amateur service

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 9 Jun 1994 18:14:27 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!
col.hp.com!srngenprp!donrm@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Question about Radar Jamming
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:

> absent. If you're emitting light from a motor vehicle I suspect that would be
> covered under state laws that govern the types of lights that can be installed
> on a car.

It wouldn't surprise me that there's a law (particularly California)
that covers IR radiation from a moving vehicle.

I'd guess that they'd get you under 'obstruction of justice' or some
other arcane edict. Like the military's 'article 15', there's probably
a chapter/section/verse codified that covers any kind of jamming.

Don K6LTS

donrm@sr.hp.com

Date: 9 Jun 1994 14:11:01 -0400
From: newstf01.cr1.aol.com!search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Usefulness of the amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In asking for usefulness to "the nation", you ignore usefulness to individuals... specifically individuals who are not hams. The nation is made up of such individuals, and that, in toto, makes up "usefulness to the nation".

It could be argued in this manner that even disaster relief is of no use to the nation, because only a few individuals benefit. I think you would take issue with that... if you do not, then I don't know what you even mean by "usefulness to the nation".

I suppose also that there is =no= service, of any sort, that could not be provided in some other manner. When a person calls on the telephone to report an accident, and hears "We have it already", is this evidence that the telephone system should be replaced? It certainly is not evidence that ham radio should be replaced. It's not a question of whether something theoretically could "replace" the benefits to other individuals of the nation that ham radio provides... the question is whether this exists, functions, is in place, etc.

It is not. Ham radio is it.

Jose KD1SB

Date: Thu, 9 Jun 94 10:17:39 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun6.124354.12073@cs.brown.edu>, <CSLE87-070694100513@145.39.1.,
<2t6irn\$j3c@ccnet.ccnet.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Bob Wilkins n6fri <rwilkins@ccnet.com> writes:

>Ed your proposal is not about sharing at all. Technically you are only
>sharing with Michael. What about all the other repeaters using their tones
>to share the spectrum? You will be repeating the multitude of other

>repeater users that share the frequency. Your repeater is now repeating
>all the nuisance interference to Michaels group as well as your own.
>Michaels group learned the merits of using p1 tone and are good neighbors.

I'm not talking about a conflict that may raise between Michael's or my
repeater and others in adjoining areas -- which you correctly point out may
well be a problem. My point refers to the direct conflict between two
proposals to cover essentially the same area, one with a closed system and
the other with an open system. It could work the same way if I also tone-coded
my machine with a different tone -- one different from Michael's, and not in
conflict with neighboring repeaters -- and made that tone public.

Date: Thu, 9 Jun 94 10:23:13 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun6.124354.12073@cs.brown.edu>, <CSLE87-070694100513@145.39.1.1,
<Anthony_Pelliccio-090694092855@138.16.64.16>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Tony Pelliccio <Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu> writes:

>> one on the same pair that is activated only by carriers WITHOUT your tone?

>The problem with this is that everytime an authorized user of Mike's
>machine keys up, even though tone-squelch is on, it'll key up your
>repeater. If someone without tone keys up you're correct in your statement
>that Mike's machine would stay off.

You misread my statement. My machine would detect the tone of Mike's repeater
and INHIBIT when that tone is present.

Date: 9 Jun 1994 17:53:10 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU!kennish@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CSLE87-070694100513@145.39.1., <2t6irn\$j3c@ccnet.ccnet.com>,
<Z42PHG8.edellers@delphi.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <Z42PHG8.edellers@delphi.com>,
Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> wrote:

(stuff about nets deleted)

>I don't need coordination. Part 97 says only that an uncoordinated repeater
>is obligated not to interfere with coordinated repeaters, and my "not the
>other machine's tone" plan insures that my machine will not interfere with
>Michael's group in this situation.

Maybe not. The two repeaters DO share the same output, no? If a QSO is going on the coordinated repeater, and someone keys your repeater, it is possible that your repeater output will interfere with the existing QSO, depending on the locations of the 4 parties (TX/RX on each machine). How far do you take this concept? Put 25 machines on a pair with different PLs? Anyhow....

True, nothing REQUIRES you get coordination. But, 97.205 is CLEAR on whose responsibility it is when a non-coordinated repeater interferes with a coordinated repeater. A responsible frequency coordinator will not and should not allow what you propose without explicit permission from the existing repeater. It isn't good coordinating practice. BUT, you are free to put up your machine, but you will have to settle with the trustee of the existing machine if there is interference, and we all know who has the primary responsibility of fixing this.

Now, we don't want to flood the FCC with requests to adjudicate repeater interference cases, do we? We KNOW the answer is "go read 97.205" and if you keep bugging us, we'll take your spectrum away.

Do what you want -- part 97 clearly states that you can install your repeater. Part 97 also clearly states who is responsible if and when interference results. If you want to spend all this time and effort in this exercise, then it is within your right.

But, please don't go blaming the coordinators for the job they are supposed to do. I DO NOT want coordinators to relax their good judgement in following proper coordination standards. The coordinator's job is to determine whether placing a repeater at location X with a set of TX/RX characteristics is likely to cause harmful interference with existing machines. He makes NO judgement about the content, or whether it is open or closed unless specifically told to do so by the spectrum management folks.

In fact, frequency coordination could be done by computer, as there should be no value judgements -- it is strictly RF engineering. Now, the human element of it is trying to get trustees to talk to each other and perhaps improve the system -- forge agreements.

I've gone through my "I want my own repeater" phase already and I live in a congested area. I've shelved the idea (not too serious to begin

with) since I have no real need for my own 440 repeater, and the RF engineering to make it work where I wanted to put my box wouldn't work. If I finally put up a repeater, it'll be on 1280 -- uncongested, less people, and greater good to the community.

So, do what you want, but remember that Part 97 gives you the right to do what you want, but also places the responsibility of your actions squarely on your shoulders. Also, don't forget 97.101(a).

My long winded 2 cents.

-Ken

Date: Thu, 9 Jun 94 10:21:00 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun6.124354.12073@cs.brown.edu>, <CSLE87-070694100513@145.39.1.,
<2t6irn\$j3c@ccnet.ccnet.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Bob Wilkins n6fri <rwilkins@ccnet.com> writes:

>Politically... what happens on Monday Night Net when Michaels group must
>do their required Ares-Races area check-in. Your group has forgotten the
>Monday night net and is excited about getting their packet node up and
>running. There is a lot of talk and obviously every one is having a good
>time until Net Control tries to assert control of the frequency.

>

>Ed How would you handle this situation? Remember you must satisfy the
>needs of not only your group but the needs of the community and the Net
>that is standing by for the frequency.

Does a net have the right to bump an existing QSO off a frequency? I think not.

>I sure hope your answer is a good one. Our coordinating group would not
>coordinate your proposal unless Michael concured in writing. How do you
>convince Michael and his group that your proposal is a good thing.

I don't need coordination. Part 97 says only that an uncoordinated repeater is obligated not to interfere with coordinated repeaters, and my "not the other machine's tone" plan insures that my machine will not interfere with Michael's group in this situation.

Date: 9 Jun 1994 13:30:01 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CSLE87-070694100513@145.39.1.1, <2t4fpt\$pg8@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>,
<567NnIv.edellers@delphi.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <567NnIv.edellers@delphi.com>, Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>
wrote:

> Michael P. Deignan <md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu> writes:
>
> >Karl, I'll repeat it one more time. I don't know why people have such a
> >hard time understanding this... I've never claimed that I, or anyone else,
> >OWN a frequency. I HAVE claimed that repeater owners - even of closed
> >repeaters - have the same rights as everyone else - to expect interference-
> >free operation of their repeater.
> >
> >Does this mean that I oppose frequency sharing? Not at all. If you can
> >provide a means of sharing frequencies and at the same time eliminating
> >(or at least reducing to minimum levels) interference then you have
> >my support.
>
> Okay, what if I -- knowing that your machine has tone squelch -- put another
> one on the same pair that is activated only by carriers WITHOUT your tone?
> If one of your authorized users keys up your machine comes up and mine remains
> dormant; if someone else does yours stays off (since there's no tone) and mine
> goes active. Neither interferes with the other at all.

The problem with this is that everytime an authorized user of Mike's
machine keys up, even though tone-squelch is on, it'll key up your
repeater. If someone without tone keys up you're correct in your statement
that Mike's machine would stay off.

But in the world of amateur radio it doesn't work that way.

--
== Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR
== Anthony_Pelliccio@brown.edu, Tel. (401) 863-1880 Fax. (401) 863-2269
== The opinions above are my own and not those of my employer.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #247
